LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

AFTER WASHINGTON
The Editor

★

THE ROOT OF THE CRISIS
Hugo Rathbone

★

A REAL ALTERNATIVE TO MLF
Quaestor

★

Labour and the Technological Revolution: John Eaton

Modern Agriculture Under Capitalism: J. Kuczynski

Congo and Counter-Revolution: Idris Cox

JANUARY 1965

Two Shillings

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL 47 No. 1 JANUARY . 1965

CONTENTS

Page

Notes of the Month: After Washington. *Washington Warning—'Commitment to U.S. Global Nuclear Strategy'—M.L.F. or A.N.F.? Neither!—Myth of Non-Proliferation'—Is the 'U.S. Veto' a Safeguard?—We Can Defeat M.L.F.—Facts of Life-and Death—Queen's Speech and After—Theories of the 'Banker's Ramp'—The Real Contradiction and the Real Choice—Roll On, 'Backlash'!* ..... **R.P.D.** 1

The Root of the Crisis. An analysis of Britain's economic crisis and the Labour Government's 'remedies'.....**Hugo Rathbone** 16

Congo and Counter-Revolution. The true facts of this neo-colonialist offensive.....**Idris Cox** 22

A Real Alternative to M.L.F. A constructive critique of Wilson's foreign policy ..... **Quaestor** 28

Labour and the Technological Revolution. The struggle for social modernisation of Britain.....**John Eaton** 33

Modern Agriculture Under Capitalism. An examination of the technical revolution in agriculture.....**Jurgen Kuczynski** 38

Illustration: Patrice Lumumba. Hero of African Liberation. 23

Book Reviews: ETYMOLOGY OF NEO-COLONIALISM. 'Neo-Colonialism', Brian Crozier: *R.P.D.;* IN HONOUR OF BERNAL. 'The Science of Science', Ed. by M. Goldsmith and A. Mackay: *Clemens Dutt;* 'William Morris: the Man and the Myth', R. Page Arnot: *Lionel Mumby.* 44

Inspiration ..... **Helen Falber** 48

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

AFTER WASHINGTON

I regard with gloom the prospect of the first international act of the Labour Government being to go off to Washington to sign on as 'tail-end Charlies' in an American nuclear bomber with a German co-pilot. . . . I do not see the necessity for strengthening Nato.

KONNI ZILLIACUS, M.P., House of Commons, November 23, 1964.

December 14, 1964

The honeymoon is over. The battles of 1965 are taking shape. Not of the people against the Labour Government. But against the most dangerous reactionary offensive which is seeking to operate through the Labour Government in order to reverse all the effects of the defeat of Toryism in the general election. Equally in the international situation and at home the sharpest challenges are presented. All the dark clouds on the home front which have caused such wide dismay during the first fifty days have now been rendered more threatening by the ominous news from Washington. There is no time to be lost in taking up the challenge and mobilising the fight of the whole labour movement if all that was won by the defeat of Toryism in October is not to be thrown away, and if, alongside the positive measures of legislative reform which have been initiated, a basic policy in the interests of the people and of peace is to replace certain present very dangerous trends.

Washington Warning

At the time of writing the promised fuller report by Harold Wilson himself of the outcome of his talks with President Johnson at Washington on December 7-9 has still to be given. No decisions were recorded. The talks were preliminary. Press reports and speculation need always to be treated with distrust. But if we base our judgment solely on the official joint communiqué, together with Mr. Wilson's own accompanying press statements, it is evident that the whole emphasis was on strengthening the Nato military cold war front. Even Ernest Bevin used always to preface his cold war outbursts with a proclamation of his undying love and affection for the Soviet Union, and desire for co-operation. No doubt in any fuller report of the talks or subsequent announcement there may be a hint of the desire for future negotiations with the Soviet Union. But in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington communiqué there is no reference to East-West relations or the socialist world save for one reference to 'the recent detonation of a Chinese nuclear device'. There is no reference to the United Nations save for a declaration of 'determination to support the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations'—that is, the illegal military interventionist operations of the type conducted in the Congo, which are now the subject of the sharpest dispute (under cover of a demand that such illegal aggressive colonialist interventions should be financed by the socialist countries which have protested against them) between the Western powers and the Soviet Union. Save for one formal reference at the end to 'continuing discussions at all levels both within the alliance and in wider international negotiations in pursuit of nuclear and conventional disarmament and all measures to reduce world tension', all the rest of the communiqué is devoted entirely to measures for 'strengthening' the 'Atlantic Alliance' in the military field in Europe, the Middle East and Asia.

'Commitment to U.S. Global Nuclear Strategy'

From the outset, in his first speech on arrival at Washington (where the unusual parade of a military fanfare, guard of honour and nineteen-gun salute had been laid on to impress and flatter the distinguished visitor, like the old nineteenth-century British Raj receiving the Shah of Persia), Premier Wilson announced as the main aim of his visit

> to do all in our power to strengthen our Alliance and to make it more effective.

Similarly the communiqué:

> The importance of strengthening the unity of the Atlantic Alliance in its strategic nuclear defence . . . to strengthen the systems of regional alliance in Europe, the Middle East and the Far East . . . legitimate interests of all members of the Alliance . . . further discussions among interested members of the Alliance . . . the burden of defence should be shared more equitably among the countries of the free world . . . close allied co-operation in international affairs.

Even in respect of the colonial wars in Vietnam and Indonesia a bargain of mutual support was struck. American pressure for a token British contingent in Vietnam was countered by pointing out that British military forces of 20,000 were already engaged in Malaysia, or an exactly comparable number with the 20,000 American military forces engaged in South Vietnam. So the communiqué registered the deal:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> They recognised the particular importance of the military effort which both their countries are making in support of legitimate Governments in South East Asia, particularly in Malaysia and South Vietnam.

'Legitimate governments!' Not only for the Tunku régime established in the artificial neo-colonialist puppet state of 'Malaysia', but for the open torture and terror of the military dictatorship in South Vietnam, which every American news correspondent has now admitted is collapsing before the opposition of the entire population and unable to last a day without the support of the invading American troops. Has British Labour really been brought down to the level of supporting this? No wonder the *Guardian* on December 10 summed up the outcome of Washington as 'a commitment to join more closely than ever in the global nuclear strategy of the United States'.

M.L.F. or A.N.F.? Neither!

At the heart of this 'commitment to U.S. global nuclear strategy' is the plan for a Nato nuclear force with West German participation. Whether this plan finally takes the form of the initial U.S.-West German proposal for a 'Multilateral Nuclear Force' of Polaris-equipped surface ships with mixed-manned crews and 40 per cent West German participation, or the alternative Labour proposal for an 'Atlantic Nuclear Force', with a much wider range of nuclear forces, including V bombers and Polaris submarines, 'assigned' to Nato, with West German participation in control and operation, makes no difference to the essence of the matter. Labour's electoral programme made much of absolute opposition to the 'current' plan for M.L.F., only to follow up with its 'constructive proposals' for A.N.F., which is in fact an extended and even more dangerous version of M.L.F. On the basis of this two-faced statement, either half could be used according to the audience. Labour and popular opinion, alarmed and angry over the proposal of M.L.F., could be appeased by the pledge, repeated by Wilson in parliament, of absolute unalterable opposition to M.L.F. Meanwhile the same essential aim could be pursued under another name. This was evidently the line which Wilson put forward at Washington, and which was recognised as a basis for further negotiations with the Nato allies. From his subsequent statement at his press conference on December 9, that he was 'not irrevocably opposed to mixed-manning', it would appear that he has also left the door open for the possible inclusion of a mixed-manned contingent (M.L.F.) inside A.N.F. It is also worth noting that in his TV interview just before departing on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

December 9 he further stated that he did not have in mind to assign all Britain's nuclear V-bombers to Nato: '*Some of our V-bombers are needed to maintain our world-wide rôle*'. For Asia?

Myth of 'Non-Proliferation'

The essence of the proposals of either M.L.F. or A.N.F.—or both, as the final plan may turn out—is to accord to West Germany the right of participation in the control and operation of nuclear weapons. This is the obvious grim menace which M.L.F. and A.N.F. represent. The West German militarists have made no secret of their determination to secure nuclear weapons, or of their openly proclaimed aim to restore the frontiers of Hitler's Germany of 1937 at the expense of other states. But the most extraordinary confidence trick of the whole operation is that, equally in the Washington communiqué and in Wilson's statements, the plan to give West Germany participation in the control and operation of nuclear weapons is presented and even advocated as the fulfilment of the principle of 'non-proliferation' of nuclear weapons. Otherwise, it is claimed, West Germany would make its own nuclear weapons, either alone or in conjunction with de Gaulle; but M.L.F. or A.N.F. will, we are assured, be safe, because there will always be a U.S. veto. Thus in his interview in Washington on December 9 Wilson stated (*The Times*, December 10, 1964):

> He was not irrevocably opposed to mixed-manning, but he did oppose any weakening of an American veto. He had told the Russians in Moscow that the Multilateral Force proposals did not mean a German finger on the trigger; instead, it reflected a determination to prevent proliferation. . . He had no doubts as to the American willingness to use nuclear weapons in the defence of Europe. A Labour Government had helped to negotiate the Nato treaty, and he was shocked by suggestions that the United States might not honour it.

Trust the Pentagon and U.S. militarists, who have been responsible for the whole criminal policy of rearming German militarism, and are now in the forefront in staging the present reckless campaign for placing nuclear weapons in the hands of their beloved allies, Hitler's generals and successors, to have either the wish or the capacity to restrain the latter once nuclear weapons are in their hands? What a 'safeguard' for a British Premier to offer the British people or the Soviet Union!

Shades of Munich!

Must we really live again through the fatal illusions of Munich?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What was Munich? The essence of Munich was the belief that the 'Russian menace' made it necessary to rearm German militarism, in violation of the sworn pledges at the end of the first world war, and then to hand over concession after concession to the unchained beast as the supposed 'champion' and 'bulwark' for the 'defence of Europe' against the Soviet Union. The resulting bitter experience of the second world war was declared to have killed that suicidal folly for ever. Not at all. It was a Labour Government, as Mr. Wilson has now reminded us, that built up Nato and agreed to re-arm Germany, in violation of war-time pledges, as the essential 'defence of Europe' against the 'Russian menace'. All the precious 'safeguards' that were built into the Paris Agreements in 1954 to limit the size and calibre of German rearmament, the size of ships, guns, tanks, submarines, etc., have been successively torn to pieces during these ten years—always in the name of the old familiar Munichite argument that otherwise West Germany might break away and act on its own, and that therefore the Western powers must make each successive concession to satisfy the 'just' demand of the German militarists for 'equality'. And now we have reached the last grim milestone of this fateful path: nuclear arms—positively the 'last demand' of the German militarists. Once again the old familiar Munichite argument is offered that this also must be conceded to the German militarists, the right to equality in the joint control and operation of nuclear arms, since otherwise they might take it for themselves and act independently, whereas this method will ensure the safest conditions for German nuclear rearmament under Western 'control' and thereby defeat the threat of nuclear proliferation. Thus in the name of 'non-proliferation' of nuclear arms, nuclear arms are to be proliferated.

Holy Faith in the United States

Every leading statesman and strategist has long since recognised that the picture of an impending Soviet military onslaught on Western Europe, in the name of which Nato was built up and German militarism rearmed, was a fairy tale without foundation, and that even the statistics of Soviet divisions regularly paraded at Nato headquarters have now been officially admitted to have been bogus. But Mr. Wilson might appear from his arguments to be still living in the world of Ernest Bevin. He still sees the problem as one of the 'defence of Europe' against an assumed Russian military menace, requiring the 'strengthening' of Nato, and therefore as justifying a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nato nuclear force, with West German participation, under the final control of the United States holding the key to the locks of the nuclear warheads. In support of this policy he indignantly repudiates 'doubts as to the American willingness to use nuclear weapons in the defence of Europe'. Who doubts it? Has not the United States shown readiness to use arms in 'defence' of Synghman Rhee and Chiang Kai Shek and the torture régime in South Vietnam? Has not the United States repudiated the Soviet doctrine of the nuclear 'second strike', that is, to use nuclear weapons only in answer to a nuclear attack? Have not both the United States and Britain rejected the official Soviet proposal that the nuclear powers should pledge themselves not to use nuclear weapons first? Has not the United States officially declared, in rejecting that proposal, that it must keep its hands free for a possible nuclear 'first strike' if this should be judged desirable? The only 'doubt' is on the definition of the 'defence of Europe', or the definition of the allegation of 'aggression' (including 'indirect aggression', or the leftward movement of a people within a country, without the presence of a single Soviet soldier, as in Czechoslovakia). On this crucial query every endeavour to secure enlightenment, also in legislative committees, has been met with the reply that this is an official secret. This is the slender reed on which Mr. Wilson invites the British people to place their hopes for survival, in the event of a Nato nuclear force being set up with West German participation and under United States control, with the full knowledge that if this outfit were to indulge in a nuclear adventure, Britain as the main American nuclear base would be the first target to be immediately wiped out.

The Real Menace

It is evident that Mr. Wilson has got his picture of the supposed military menace and the 'defence of Europe' the wrong way round, in defiance of all the lessons of history. The entire experience of the forty-seven years since 1917 has shown that the Soviet Union has never attacked Western imperialism, but that Western imperialism has repeatedly attacked and built up military combinations against the Soviet Union, from the wars of intervention and 'Cordon Sanitaire', then through the building up of Hitler and rearmament of German militarism, and again after the last war through the building up of Nato and renewed rearmament of German militarism, and now through the latest plan for a Nato nuclear force with West German participation. It is obvious that the real most dangerous

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

menace and potential explosion point in the modern world situation is not the imaginary threat of a Soviet aggression overrunning Western Europe, but the very unmistakable threat of the open expansionist aims of the West German militarists, if they once obtain nuclear arms and succeed in securing the co-operation of their opposite numbers in the still very influential aggressive and reactionary militarist circles in the United States.

Is the 'U.S. Veto' a Safeguard?

Mr. Wilson asks us to put all our trust in the 'U.S. veto' as the safeguard against this manifest menace. Really? Only two months ago, in the midst of a situation of world peace and relatively favourable U.S.-Soviet relations, we have seen how the mad-dog ultra-right aggressive anti-Soviet militarist sections in American ruling circles represented by Goldwaterism could capture control of one of the two ruling party machines. Can we be so certain what in five years time may come out on top in the turbid arena of the American political situation? This is decidedly too fragile a reed on which to gamble the survival of Britain. The wiser course is to fight and defeat the project for the Nato nuclear force and West German nuclear armament; to free Britain from American nuclear strategy; and to go forward with an independent foreign policy for a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe, already set out in Labour's electoral programme, as the next step for relieving tension and diminishing the danger of a new major war.

We Can Defeat M.L.F.

Time is short. But we can still defeat M.L.F.—or its twin brother A.N.F. Popular opinion in Britain is overwhelmingly against it; France is against; U.S. opinion outside the Administration is sceptical. Mr. Wilson won his biggest cheer at the Labour Party Conference at Brighton on December 12 when he denounced the press lie that he had given to President Johnson 'a secret pledge that we were prepared to participate in a mixed-manned surface fleet'. He did not get the same cheer when he went on to say that 'we had totally reserved our position on this question'. The old 'lesser evil' argument that a Nato nuclear force with West German participation should be accepted, because otherwise West Germany will develop its nuclear arms independently or in association with de Gaulle, whereas within the framework of M.L.F. or A.N.F. there will be 'no German finger on the trigger', misses the essential technical point which has been

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

repeatedly emphasised in our magazine and which is very clearly presented in Quaestor's article in our current issue.

Winning Time for Peace

Certainly the West German militarists are determined to obtain nuclear arms, as made clear in the Bundeswehr General Staff memorandum of August 1960.* Certainly they possess the technological basis, have no doubt already assembled all the necessary parts and installations for production (the 'largest missile launching base in Europe' is being constructed by the Bundeswehr in the Belgian Ardennes, close to the French frontier, behind barbed wire, according to *l'Humanité* of November 12 reporting the protests of local municipal councils), and can be presumed to be closely linked with General de Gaulle's preparations. But the experience of de Gaulle, who has just announced his hope of reaching some years from now his first hydrogen bomb and medium-distance bombers or surface sites to project them, has shown how prolonged is the process to reach mastery in this sphere. Hence this is not the best bet from the point of view of the German militarists. If, on the other hand, they can once get their hands on the latest most advanced U.S. models of the Polaris type, handle them and get full training in their operation, they do not need to worry about 'the finger on the trigger' or the U.S. key to the safety lock. They can thenceforth make their own, without the requirement of years of testing, and take advantage of all the results of the latest U.S. tests. No wonder they are so keen on M.L.F. as their best bet. This is what makes it so essential to defeat M.L.F., or any similar variant of a Nato nuclear force with West German participation, while there is still time. The British labour movement can at this moment play a decisive rôle to defeat this menace, and open the way for new initiatives for peace and nuclear disarmament.

Washington and Britain

It is obvious that the outcome of the Washington talks has the most profound effect on the internal situation in Britain. If Britain is to fulfil the initially proclaimed Wilson-Healey-Walker programme to strengthen Nato, build the Polaris submarines, participate in the multilateral Atlantic Nuclear Force, increase the occupation troops

*'The Bundeswehr must have effective weapons similar to those possessed by the Allied Armed Forces. . . . Bundeswehr soldiers have every right to have weapons at least equal to those of the enemy. The responsibility for their soldiers makes the commanders of formations . . . demand the atomic weapons required for the armed forces.'
(*Bulletin des Presse—und Informationsamtes der Bundesregierung*, August 20, 1960.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in West Germany to 55,000, maintain the bases in Cyprus and Aden and Singapore and elsewhere, recruit Gurkhas and continue the war for the maintenance of the neo-colonialist satellite Malaysia, this can only be at the expense of urgent social and economic needs at home. The consequent burdens of overseas expenditure can only hamper essential home productive development, increase the costs of British manufacturers in contrast with other industrial countries less heavily burdened, and thereby cripple the exports drive and render precarious the position of sterling, however desperate the efforts of the people to produce more and export more in order to meet the crisis. The experience of the first two months of the Labour Government has abundantly shown the truth of this.

Facts of Life—and Death

In contrast to the bland assumptions and well-meant promises of the election programme, these two months have shown the overpowering primacy of the crisis of sterling and the balance of payments overriding the most urgent social needs, even to the extent of leaving tens of thousands of old age pensioners to perish of cold and shortage this winter. At the very moment when a medical report published in *The Practitioner* was estimating that from twenty thousand to one hundred thousand old age pensioners perish each year from the not officially diagnosed cause of 'hypothermia' (extreme cold through lack of means of warmth and nourishment on the basis of existing provision and rates), Cabinet Ministers were assembled to quell the revolt of Parliamentary Labour Party back benchers who demanded an earlier payment of the pensions increase before March 29, and the Prime Minister was refusing to receive a deputation of forty or fifty of these M.P.s desiring to press this elementary humanitarian claim against a sentence of death on tens of thousands of human beings. The formal official excuse that administrative complications rendered impossible any earlier payment was recognised by all as a thin disguise for the real decisive factor, blurted out by George Brown, that the economic situation and the 'tough' policy which the Government was having to carry out to meet it, and to stave off the financial critics on whose loans they depended, ruled out any such concession.*

*At the Brighton Labour Party Conference Mr. Wilson on the Saturday still repeated the administrative explanation:

'If the Conservative Government had decided that pensions should have been increased and had started the preparations in July or August, we could have had these increases in force by Christmas.'

Mr. George Brown on the Sunday reaffirmed that the true explanation was not the administrative problem, for which the Ministry of Pensions had prepared a possible solution, but the financial situation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Shock

The painful effects of the emergency measures adopted in the first phase of the Labour Government to meet the crisis of sterling and of the balance of payments: the crippling increase in bank rate; heightened tariffs; taxation increases far exceeeding the promises of future social benefits; rising mortgage rates; a selective credit squeeze; the dependence on foreign banks, with continuing instability of sterling and threats of future devaluation: all these effects are making themselves felt in every household through sharply rising prices and the prospect of possible recession and increases of unemployment. Inevitably all this has come as a shock to many of the Labour rank and file, who had believed with implicit faith in the electoral promises of a smooth and rapid economic growth and rising incomes, once Toryism was out of the way, and had been kept in cocooned ignorance of the realities of imperialism and its consequences for Britain. They had been nourished on the initial electoral propaganda of Harold Wilson and the other leaders emphasising that domestic plain and simple bread-and-butter issues, plus a dynamic impetus to the economy, would take first place, and that international issues were of limited concern for the masses of the people. Everything that has happened since October 17 has proved the opposite. A process of political education of the labour movement is taking place. But the cost is heavy.

Echoes of a Vanished Age

Before and after October 17 is the difference of two worlds. If we were to exhume now all those general election speeches and broadcasts of the three official parties, nothing would be more remarkable than their remoteness from the dominant issues of the present day. There is no hint of awareness of the urgent questions which have since hit the headlines and been forced by reality into the forefront of attention—but which at the time of the general election the Communists were almost alone in placing in the forefront. Thus, for example, the pivotal question of the burden of overseas military expenditure as the main cause of the deficit was still the 'guilty secret', as we wrote at the time, never so much as mentioned by any of the spokesmen of the three official parties in all their elaborate discussions of the problems of imports and exports, and only brought out and highlighted by the Communists alone of the four parties. The exclusion of the latter spokesmen, as well as of any Left Labour representatives, from radio and television, ensured that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the true facts of Britain's critical economic situation should be kept hidden from the electorate until after the election. Today this crucial problem has become the commonplace of discussion on all sides, ever since the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his budget speech on November 11 for the first time broke the previous official silence, and directly referred to the burden of £350 million overseas expenditure as the biggest single factor in the deficit. However, there is no clearness yet on what to do about it. For the question is no simple question of a Treasury review to discover a few economies here and there, as the Chancellor seemed to imply. What is involved is the entire policy and rôle of Britain in the modern world.

Queen's Speech and After

The difference of two worlds does not merely apply to the political climate of the general election. It continued to apply also during the first few days after the election, after the formation of the Labour Government, even after Ministers had learned the extent of the deficit, and, still at the mercy of the simplified picture of the balance of imports and exports as the problem, had sought to cure it by the device of a heavy imports surcharge and an exports subsidy—with no sign of awareness of the bigger problems which were to follow. It is only necessary to examine the Queen's Speech of November 3 in the light of present knowledge to see on permanent record this lack of awareness. The purpose of a Queen's Speech is to indicate the most important measures a Government proposes to undertake. This Queen's Speech of November 3 did indeed refer to the 'Government's first concern to maintain the strength of sterling by dealing with the short-term balance of payments difficulties'. But after this cursory reference the subsequent vast array of projected legislation and measures elaborately set out, and representing the most admirable intentions, contained no hint of the really most important, most dramatic and most controversial measures which the Government was in fact about to carry out in the immediately succeeding weeks. The Queen's Speech spoke of 'rising productivity', 'purposeful expansion', and 'more stable prices'. The real world which followed was the world of Bank Rate at 7 per cent, with all the consequences of higher interest charge in bringing restriction; the official abandonment of the 4 per cent growth rate as an immediate target; rising prices through the effects of the imports surcharge calculated to bring £200 million to the Exchequer; and a deflationary budget representing a net increase in taxation by £210 million. A sudden

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leap from the Fabian Utopia to the realities of imperialist Britain.

Consolatory Theories

It is not surprising that in face of this hard succession of shocks since the election many in the labour movement should have tried at first to find consolation in facile theories which do not yet face the realities of the situation. The simplest and most obvious of these would-be explanations has been to lay the blame for the whole crisis on 'the consequences of thirteen years of Tory rule', which the blameless Labour Government has now inherited and is in consequence compelled to take courageously the most energetic steps, however painful, to clear up the mess left by their predecessors. Certainly no words can be too harsh for the misgovernment of Britain by Toryism for thirteen years. But this simplified explanation of the crisis will not hold water. For precisely this type of crisis of British imperialism, expressed in chronically recurring deficits in the balance of payments, reflecting the reckless government overspending abroad and astronomically rising arms expenditure, and met by successive desperate economy measures whose effects in the end only deepen the crisis, has characterised all the *nineteen* years since the close of the war, equally under Labour and Tory Governments. 'Stop-Go' began with Cripps, not Selwyn Lloyd. The first big crisis of a deficit of the balance of payments occurred in 1947; and it was in 1948 that Cripps brought in his austerity régime and wage-freeze. Further, the main lines of the imperialist foreign and strategic policies conducted by the Tory Government during its thirteen years of office, Nato and the American alliance and B.A.O.R. and overseas garrisons and rising arms programmes, were conducted in the main with Labour Front Bench support, so that it is misleading now to present the consequences as solely the price of Toryism and not of both Tory and Labour Imperialism.

Theories of the 'Bankers' Ramp'

A second favourite consolatory theory has been to ascribe the crisis of sterling, and the consequent painful emergency economic measures imposed on the Government, as an 'international bankers' ramp', the evil work of the 'gnomes of Zurich', conspiring to undermine a Labour Government. Certainly no one would wish to underestimate the completely callous and cold-blooded calculations of all bankers and financiers, foreign or British, who will at any time shift their dealings in any currency according to their estimates of profit

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or loss, and would soon be out of business if they did not. Patriotism has no place in any such calculations, as the testimony before the Bank Enquiry Tribunal indicated. But nor are these cold-blooded business calculations subordinated to subjective aims of a political conspiracy to overthrow a Labour Government. The bankers and financiers are in this respect barometers rather than prime movers. If they regard with scepticism the capacity of sterling to combine a costly imperialist policy of high expenditure abroad with large-scale costly social reform at home, unless drastic restrictions are imposed on the workers and home consumption, the cause lies in the contradiction of the policy rather than in a conspiracy of the bankers. The conspiracy theory will not wash. The viewpoint of not inconsiderable City circles found expression in the *Economist* when on the eve of the election it came out in favour of a Labour Government as the better choice at the moment from the standpoint of business interests. Indeed, the unprecedented three billion dollar loan from the central banks of all the leading capitalist countries represented an operation to save the Labour Government rather than to overthrow it. Confronted with this apparent anomaly in the conspiracy theory *Tribune* characteristically, in an article by Michael Foot on December 4 after the customary denunciation of 'international bankers behaving like Luddites', 'boneheads in Zurich', 'the fatuity of international finance', proceeded to explain the 'rescue operations for the pound' by referring these to a 'second group' of international financiers who 'acted with some sense of international responsibility'.

The Real Contradiction and the Real Choice

It is no use trying to evade the plain issues of the present crisis of British imperialism by looking for scapegoats, whether in Tory predecessors or international financiers.

> In tragic life, God wot,
> We are betrayed by what is false within

Harold Wilson and his associates genuinely believed, in accordance with the theories of modern Fabianism and the 'New Thinkers' and prophets of the 'New Capitalism' superseding Marxism, that it would be possible to provide the essential programme of extending social reforms, benefits, and provision for health, education and housing out of the harmonious expansion of the dynamic planned economy of the 'New Capitalism', and at the same time, if confronted with Tory chauvinist challenges, to treat foreign and strategic policy as if it existed in a separate compartment, to beat

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the big drum even louder than the Tories, call for Britain to be 'strong East of Suez' and demand a Bigger Navy and more efficiently equipped armed forces. Marxist talk of 'capitalism' and 'socialism' was regarded as a hangover of obsolete doctrinaire shibboleths. But the reality of the 'New Capitalism' is not the imaginary Fabian blueprint in a vacuum. It is British monopoly capitalism, that is, British imperialism, the centre of a world system of imperialist exploitation, with its own laws, problems and requirements. This is what the Labour Ministers have had to discover after coming into office. The Tories said that the social reforms could not be financed without increased taxation. Labour said that the social reforms could be financed out of the expanding growth of a planned economy without requiring new taxation. The Communists said that all the reforms offered and more could be financed without new taxation, provided the waste of imperialist expenditure, the overseas military drain and the arms programme were cut, and inroads made into the monopolies, but that it would not be possible to combine both. The Communists insisted that a choice must be made. The Communists warned that otherwise the election would be followed by the most critical economic conditions leading to an offensive against the standards of the workers. Since coming into office, Harold Wilson and his associates have had to learn from the blows of hard experience that what the Communists said was true. Now the choice has to be made. It is for the labour movement to see that the choice shall reverse the present imperialist policies and win the day for a policy in the interests of peace and the social needs of the people.

Roll On, 'Backlash'!

The *Economist,* that sometimes shrewd organ of City interests, expressed its delight on November 28, in common with most other Conservative commentators, that 'external events have been pushing the Labour Government rightward', and even mischievously suggested that 'it will not be altogether surprising if whispers of the name of Ramsay MacWilson begin to be heard'. But then in the same issue further consideration of the prospect replaced the exultation by a panic fear of horrifying 'possibility'. 'The moderately right-wing policy' at present pursued by the Labour Government might, this organ suggests, give rise to

> the possibility of a future popular backlash, damagingly anti-foreign and damagingly anti-City. The worst possible end to this sorry mess would be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if Labour were driven or allowed to fight—and win—the next election on that.

Their fear is our hope. The nightmare foreseen by these pundits of the City is the possibility that the revolt of the trade union and labour movement to change the present right-wing policies might win the day for a more left-wing policy, and that such a left-wing policy might triumphantly win the next general election with an increased majority. If that is what they mean by 'backlash'—then Roll On, Backlash!

R.P.D.

New Year Greetings to our readers and many friends from the editor and staff of Labour Monthly.

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

REICHSTAG ELECTIONS

During the election campaign the Communist Party was subjected to a reign of terror and carefully planned Governmental persecution which recalls pre-revolutionary days in Tsarist Russia, and of which it is difficult to write in cold blood. . . . Directly after the dissolution of the Reichstag, warrants were issued for the arrest of all the sixty-two Communist ex-Deputies: official denials of this were silenced by the discovery of the confidential *Police Bulletin* containing the photographs and descriptions of thirty-five of their number. Many arrests were effected, and those who escaped arrest were forced to remain in hiding and were unable to take part in open propaganda. Further, the 8,000 political prisoners in Germany comprised many of the most active officials and propagandists of the Communist Party. The Party itself estimated that, as a result of imprisonment and police persecution, some 10,000 of its best members were 'immobilised' during the election campaign. . . .

Polling day for the Reichstag Elections . . . was on December 7. The Fascists (901,601) are completely eclipsed: but the Communist collapse prophesied by the Social-Democrats has not materialised. To maintain 75 per cent (2,698,956) of the poll of last May, in face of persecution . . . must be counted a great achievement.

(From 'The World of Labour', *Labour Monthly*, January 1925.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ROOT OF THE CRISIS

Hugo Rathbone

'THE run on sterling brought Labour up against reality.' So said the *Financial Times* editorial on November 26, the fateful day on which it was announced that the Bank of England had been instructed to mobilise credit from the other central banks of the Western world and had succeeded in doing so from eleven of them to the tune of $3,000 million to last for from 3 to 6 months at the most. This 'crisis of confidence' has been caused by the failure of the Labour Government to convince the other capitalist countries of the world that it was competent to run the British economy in the interests of capitalist exploitation.

This crisis, following on the balance of payments deficit which had built up since the early summer under the Tory Government, was sparked off by Callaghan in his little budget on November 11. His import surcharge plus the export rebate got a mountingly bad reception from EFTA as well as from the Common Market countries. Then came the omission to raise the Bank Rate as was expected on November 19. It also became obvious that most of the $1,000 million credit granted by the IMF had already been mortgaged. Meanwhile from Friday, November 20 talks of a forced devaluation of the pound swept through Europe with *The Times* well in the vanguard of the chase. So on Monday, November 23, the Government gave way partially by raising the Bank Rate from 5 to 7 per cent. But still this did not stem the tide of selling, shared from London by 'industrial, commercial and financial firms' against 'a possible devaluation' reported by *The Times* of November 25 and 26, and ruefully admitted by them to be 'the most disquieting element in the situation'.

On Thursday, November 25, the final decision was taken. No terms for this new huge credit have been stated but, in spite of Labour's assertion that it was against any new stop-go régime, with the eagle-eye of every one of the lending countries deciding to keep strict surveillance of the Government's every step, some degree of credit squeeze is inevitable. Callaghan had said in the Commons already on November 24 that he was 'expecting the banks would wish to moderate the expansion in their lendings'. He has had to announce that three steps must now be taken 'to pay our way': an exports priority, cuts in Government expenditure and a manpower release.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gone are the dreams of an expanding economy, a 4 per cent rise in the gross annual product and a happy alliance at last of science and industry along the road to a new revolution. Now it is in fact stop-go and its consequent increase in stagnation and corruption in every phase of life.

The enormous size of this credit, so *The Times* City Editor admitted on November 26, was due to the fact that 'if sterling had had to be devalued most other currencies also including the American dollar would probably have had' to follow suit. To save themselves they had to save the pound but only along the path of deflation.

Whatever development there may be in this still crisis situation, let us first examine the basis on which it has been built up. The *Guardian* for November 21, in an editorial pointed out that as against the total of £689 million envisaged by Mr. Callaghan as coming in from his taxation proposals in a whole year, he would be met with a bill of £269 million for the social benefits proposed plus the export tax rebate. This would leave him a surplus of £420 million apart from the corporation tax and capital gains tax which he said he would introduce in the April budget. As the *Guardian* concluded 'the Government's immediate plans are demonstrably thrifty'. From this it would have seemed that there is no sort of basis for this 'crisis of confidence'. Is it then just a class manoeuvre or really a basic indication of the present precarious state of the British imperialist economy—still 'slithering from one crisis to another', as Peter Thorneycroft admitted that it was doing, back in 1958, down 'the road to ruin'?

Press and propaganda, both Tory and Labour, has been almost unanimous for months past in saying that the root cause of the trouble is the lack of sufficient exports. But is this really so? To find out we must examine the main core of imperialist economy. As Lenin pointed out in his *Imperialism*:

> Under the old capitalism when free competition prevailed, the export of *goods* was the most typical feature. Under modern capitalism, when monopolies prevail, the export of *capital* has become the typical feature. (Vol. XIX, p. 135, Lenin's own emphasis.)

Lenin went on to describe what happened under this monopoly stage of capitalism. He pointed out that if capitalism could raise the standard of living of the masses there could be no talk of a super-abundance of capital.

> If capital did these things it would not be capitalism, for uneven development and wretched conditions of the masses are fundamental and inevitable conditions and premises of this mode of production. As long

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> as capitalism remains what it is, surplus capital will never be used for the purpose of raising the standard of living of the masses of a given country, for this would mean a decline in profits for the capitalists; it will be used for increasing these profits by exporting capital abroad to the backward countries. (Vol. XIX, p. 136.)

This export of capital, as Lenin said nearly 50 years ago, is the typical feature of monopoly capitalism today as yesterday. The Bank of England in its March 1964 Bulletin, estimated that, of the total of all British assets abroad amounting to £13,000 million, the private investments overseas (*i.e.*, held by British capitalists) amount to just on £8,000 million. It had to admit that this is a 'substantial underestimate'; for all its figures, it said, are 'precarious' or 'known to be incomplete' and for many items no estimate at all was given, *e.g.*, for bank assets, individual or other holdings or real estate or trade credits 'not otherwise included'. It seems certain that the real total of all such investments approaches something like £10,000 million.

In the Government's Balance of Payments statement the total earnings, etc., received on these investments for the 12 years to 1963 amounted to £12,294 million. But this is by no means the whole of the story; for in addition there are shipowners' freight charges and civil aviation earnings amounting to £8,088 million. All in all the admitted receipts by British imperialism in these twelve years to 1963 from their investment overseas amounted to a grand total of £20,382 million.* This more than £20,000 million result of 12 years of exploitation is, of course, being increased from year to year. According to these figures a total of £3,091 million capital has been exported abroad in the last twelve years; in 1963 it was £309 million.

But against this huge figure of overseas resources, estimated by the Bank of England, and the yearly big figure of exploitation that it produces, British imperialism in its decline has had to face a debit in its overall financial relations with other capitalist countries. First of all an increasing investment in Britain chiefly by American capital has been taking place.† For 1952 the total of all capital imported was only £13 million compared with an export of British capital of

*Six years ago the writer, on the basis of these official Balance of Payments figures, estimated that the total annual bill of exploitation by British imperialism of the overseas peoples came to £1,000 million a year, £750 million of which I calculated from the Balance of Payments figures then current. Since then these figures have continued from year to year to have been steadily revised upwards. For instance the figure for 'interest profits and dividends' plus other services for 1956 on which I based my estimate in 1958, has, in the last accounts (those correct up to 1963), been given as £948 million instead of the then figure of £645 million. Though I have not given any exact revision in this article to take account of these changes of the estimate of £1,000 million it is obvious that on the same basis and with other information coming in, the present yearly bill of exploitation of overseas peoples by British imperialism now amounts to at least £1,500 million if not approaching £2,000 million.

†According to the Bank of England Bulletin, already quoted, the total of all foreign investments in Britain, except for insurance and banking, amounted to £2,135 million at the end of 1962. *LRD Fact Service* (No. 28 of 1964), quoting the U.S. 'Current Business'. says that £1,500 million of this came from U.S.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

£127 million. But this gap has steadily narrowed so that by 1963 overseas capital imports had risen to £259 million compared with £309 million of British capital exported. It has been the same with all the other items we have mentioned above. Overseas owned shipping freight charges are even greater now than what British shipping itself earns—£671 million as against £660 million. The result is that the net earnings by British imperialism for these 'invisible' items has been tending sharply to decline. This is one more reason behind the balance of payments crisis. For traditionally these invisible exports were relied upon to provide a surplus in the balance of payments.

Just as U.S. imperialism has military bases all over the world primarily to defend its overseas investments (the expenses for these reached the sum of 88,154 million dollars in 1963, says *LRD Fact Service*, No. 43 of 1964), so British imperialism has kept up and gradually increased in the last twelve years this overseas military expenditure primarily, remember, to defend its overseas investments. In 1952 the total amounted to £187 million (including grants—mainly bribes—to local rulers who showed that they were willing to follow British policies). In 1963 this military expenditure overseas had increased to £346 million.*

Now it is this export of capital plus its consequential military expenditure, in all amounting to at least £650 million, which if drastically curtailed, would serve to meet most of the estimated deficit in the balance of payments. But here's the rub. Is the Labour Party for or against British Imperialism? Ideally it may be against, but it now finds itself administering the Government of monopoly capitalism. Accordingly it has studiously avoided all mention even of restricting capital exports. Mr. Callaghan has agreed in his budget speech to review overseas military expenditure—indeed a House of Commons Estimates Committee, set up by the Tory Government, has already recommended certain cuts. But Mr. Callaghan obviously, but tacitly, agreed with his fellow guest at the Mansion House banquet on November 3, Lord Cromer, the Governor of the Bank of England, when the latter pontifically declared that:

> Every effort should be made within Britain's means to ensure that a proper level of remunerative investment overseas is maintained.
>
> (As reported by the City Editor of *The Times*, November 4, 1964.)

Nevertheless, it is plain that the main body of monopoly capitalist

*In an examination of this overseas military expenditure *The Times* (November 6, 1964) pointed out that the Polaris and other military equipment bought abroad is classified under imports; consequently, as they said, this figure 'underestimates the total loss of foreign exchange resulting from the defence programme. While, as R.P.D. pointed out in his December Notes last year (p. 539), the total cost of the overseas garrisons, bases and equipment remains a secret, undiscoverable even by the House of Commons Estimates Committee.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion is behind their leader, Lord Cromer, in insisting on the paramount importance of the maintenance of capital exports. As to any reduction in overseas military expenditure the *Financial Times* has for quite some time been advocating its reduction, probably in order to maintain the rate of capital export but also because this paper along with others has been trying to see if they can shuffle off some of this expenditure into the hands of the United Nations, as was tried in the Suez crisis and the Congo. But the growing importance of the alliance between the Socialist countries, who are resolutely opposed to any such course, and the Asian and African nations will probably make this increasingly impossible to achieve.

But why has the whole of capitalist opinion been so wholehearted in their advocacy of an export drive and why has the Labour Government been forced to adopt it? Lenin long ago assumed that the drive for more exports came principally from the monopolies or from those who are rising to that scale and want to widen their markets and so themselves graduate for monopoly status. That the monopolies are those who are mainly interested in the export trade has recently been admitted in capitalist circles. For instance, John Parker, writing a feature in the *Guardian* (October 26, 1964) says that 29 per cent of all British companies account for 83 per cent of all exports while just under 30 per cent of all companies do not export at all. From similar statements that have proliferated in the press recently, it is plain that the vast proportion of present-day exports are in the hands of the monopolies or near monopolies. Besides, one must always bear in mind that any increase in manufactured exports usually implies a corresponding, though lower, rise in imports necessary to produce them.

Already since the news of the 15 per cent import surcharge and the 1-3 per cent export rebate there has been a great deal of comment in the press, not only about possible evasions, but how all the taxes proposed will serve to encourage monopoly trends. The *Financial Times* (October 28, 1964) suggests that while the export rebate due to its modest proportions will certainly encourage established exporters, it will prove insufficient for any move in this direction by the smaller firms. One construction industry supply manager complained in *The Times* (November 5, 1964), that prices had already been raised to him by the full 15 per cent when the increase 'should surely be less' if the supplier concerned were to keep to the normal 10-13 per cent profit ratio. The *Observer* (November 15, 1964) says that long-term brokers are unanimous in prognosticating a 'quite

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enormous' inflation of stock exchange prices for equities in the next couple of years. Or again, a 'Notebook for Investors' in the *Guardian* (November 14, 1964) under the heading 'Good Climate for Takeovers', says that as a result of the coming capital gains levy 'a large number of private businesses are likely to come up for sale between now and April'. These moves directly encouraging monopoly trends are in line, as we showed earlier, with the inevitable results of any export drive. They should revive the already almost forgotten slogan of the Labour Party of the need to attack 'the Commanding Heights of the Economy'.

The final capitulation in raising the Bank rate to 7 per cent, followed by the granting of the $3,000 million credit by the world's central bankers with the implied submission to surveillance, will tend to postpone any possible revival of intention to restart any such attack on the Commanding Heights. It will but mean an expansion of the stagnation, corruption and decay which already affects such widespread areas of British life today. The *Observer* (November 15, 1964) in one of its series of articles entitled 'Prestige', bemoans the fact that there is little urge by British industry to inject into its veins the results already achieved in modern technology; such is the low level of industry in this regard, it says, that that word in this context merely means 'the exploitation of discoveries which have been a commonplace for 20 or 50 years . . . merely if existing knowledge and techniques were fully exploited these industries would be completely transformed'.

It is stated that, as the *Guardian* City column affirmed on November 13, the economy today is 'near to capacity'. But what are a very large number of workers engaged in? Professor Nove of Glasgow University asks despairingly 'Why is there such a great readiness to invest in the sectors here called unproductive, and with the productive sectors, in end products and other activities which promise quick returns?' (*The Times*, October 2, 1964).

Or still more revealing. *The Times* city column writer (October 17, 1964) examined the phenomenally large figure of imports for September and concluded:

> Fundamentally, however, it looks as if the consumer has taken a growing fancy to 'foreign made' goods. The more sophisticated tastes for foods as well as for clothing and furnishings, etc., have spread throughout the country; and the *trend* is being continually fed by the growth in foreign travel. (*My emphasis*, H.R.).

In an article in the *New Statesman* on October 9 last, Brian Abel Smith wrote about the misery and near-poverty he found in a section

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the population of Britain today amounting, he reckoned, to about 7 million people with their families—3 million on National Assistance, 1 million eligible for Assistance but who do not apply and a further 3 million who are ineligible but, as he says, 'hardly better off'. It is clear that these 7 million and many more who do regular overtime or feel forced to take more than one job to try to make ends meet—all these have no part in these trends reported by *The Times*.

On the other hand there are an increasing number who in one way or another are deriving part if not the whole of their income from direct or indirect participation in the tribute from overseas investments. True a large proportion of these investments are held by the monopolies; this fact alone is a growing incentive to stagnation. But the widespread holdings by individuals results in a direct investment in the so-called good things of life, leading to that now almost threadbare talk of an 'affluent society'. At the same time when these 'good things of life' are not imported, the production of them in Britain leads to the growth of parasitic industries and the employment therein of thousands becoming completely divorced from the main stream of productive industry.

Britain is so fully employed that the menial tasks are given to the flow of immigrants from the desolated scenes of age-long exploitation by British imperialism. Many a Britisher also is in miserable condiiton. This is the actuality of stagnation but full employment, while the commanding heights of the economy remain in the possession of a thousand or so of the largest monopolies.

CONGO AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION

Idris Cox

THERE seems to be no end to the butchery, torture and bloodshed of African peoples in the former Belgian Congo. Many thousands of Africans have been slaughtered in recent months in the offensive launched by foreign mercenaries hired by Tshombe to stop the advance of the Congolese Liberation Army. There was no outcry in the capitalist newspapers of the United States, Britain, and Western Europe. But when in the midst of the turmoil less than one thousand Europeans were held as hostages, the imperialist hypocrites responsible for this situation, raised their hands in horror. Not only did they raise their hands. The United States provided the planes,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PATRICE LUMUMBA

Hero of African Liberation

In January 1961, Patrice Lumumba, then Premier of the Congo, was murdered by puppets of imperialism acting under the auspices of the U.N. Mission. Above is one of the last pictures taken of him on his way in chains from Leopoldville to Elizabethville. The memory of this fine hero of the people, faithful to death, unyielding before violence and outrage, lives on as inspiration to the Congolese Liberation Army.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Labour Government in Britain provided the base on Ascension Island, and Belgium sent the paratroopers to rescue the hostages.

All this was a great 'humanitarian' expedition. The Belgian paratroopers arrived (strangely enough) just at the time that Tshombe's 'Congolese National Army', led by foreign mercenaries, were within striking distance of Stanleyville. The Belgian paratroopers and the mercenaries slaughtered thousands more Africans. But no tears were shed for these victims. Even the *Daily Telegraph* (foremost in its support of the 'humanitarian' expedition) gave this account from John Ridley, its staff correspondent in Leopoldville:

> During the past few days, about 12,000 Africans suspected of rebel sympathies have been screened in Stanleyville by Congolese Government military police.
>
> 'Trials' were held in the stadium. When a man's name was called out and the watching crowd booed he was immediately condemned to death, taken beside the river, and shot. (December 7, 1964.)

This new offensive has aroused deep indignation and overwhelming opposition throughout Africa, and indeed in all the civilised world. At the time of writing, the independent African states are taking steps to persuade the General Assembly of the United Nations (meeting in New York on December 8) to resist this fresh slaughter. Bearing in mind its earlier record, it is significant that there is little African confidence in the United Nations, and that African Heads of State will meet on December 18 *after* the General Assembly to consider the Congo situation.

After the collapse of the Katanga régime early in 1961, Tshombe went into 'voluntary exile', most of the time in Fascist Spain, but maintained close relations with Belgian ruling circles, and actually came to London last April and was presented as the only leader who could bring about 'national reconciliation' in the Congo. With the departure of the United Nations 'peace keeping' forces in the Congo on June 30 last year, it was clear that American and Belgian ruling circles—despite differences between them—were determined to find new forces to maintain their grip. American big business was rapidly supplanting the foremost position of Belgian monopoly in the Congo. Until 1961, between 30 and 35 per cent of Congo's imports were from Belgium. By the end of 1962 its share had dropped to 15 per cent. Today nearly 80 per cent of all current foreign capital investments in the Congo are from the United States. Until December 6, two-thirds of the country's mineral royalties were already being paid to Tshombe's 'Government'. The remaining third has now been taken over, out of the coffers of the Belgian monopoly,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Compagnie due Katanga. This step was intended to present Tshombe as being equally progressive as Dr. Kaunda in ending the British South Africa Company royalty rights in Zambia, but clearly is an expression of Tshombe's preference for his American paymasters.

Despite this, the advance of the Congolese Liberation Army convinced American ruling circles of the necessity of keeping Belgium as an ally. Early last January the liberation forces, led by Pierre Mulele, took the province of Kwilu, and soon after, those led by Gaston Sumialot captured the province of Kivu and advanced to take over North Katanga. By August they had taken over Stanleyville, capital of the Eastern Province. Its former Premier, Antoine Gizenga, first released by Tshombe, was again placed under 'house arrest' in Leopoldville, as a retaliation for Stanleyville, and because of Gizenga's continued opposition to Tshombe.

It was in this situation that 'it became evident that only a military solution could prevent the rebellion eventually reaching Leopoldville. The United States decided to give military support to the Congo, as it had to South Vietnam . . .' (*Financial Times*, November 26, 1964). In respect of the landing of the Belgian paratroopers it made the point that:

> Although the motive was humanitarian, its effect . . . whether intended or not . . . may be to facilitate the capture of Stanleyville by the advancing forces of Mr. Moise Tshombe, the Congolese Prime Minister.

Why did the United States, Belgium, and the Labour Government in Britain take the serious risk of alienating all the independent states of Africa? It is most unlikely they were concerned only with the internal situation in the Congo. From the standpoint of imperialism and its neo-colonialist strategy, this was serious enough. It seems obvious they were also concerned with the advance of the African liberation movement in the countries on or near the borders of the Congo.

Early in November there was a mighty upsurge in the Sudan which overthrew the military dictatorship of General Abboud. In its place there emerged a government of the National Front, restoring democratic and civil rights, and including popular leaders of the former illegal Communist Party. In the Portuguese colony of Mozambique the heroic struggle for liberation was advancing. The original hope that the union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar would retard the revolutionary advance to Zanzibar was dashed to the ground. Instead of Tanganyika swallowing Zanzibar, the political

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impact of revolutionary Zanzibar was making its mark in the new state of Tanzania.

What seems fairly clear is that the desperate military measures in the Congo are not being taken in isolation. It is one important aspect of a *new counter-revolutionary offensive* being waged against the independent African states to maintain the grip of imperialism. This is not always expressed in open military struggle (though, if not resisted, it may ultimately take this form). It is closely linked with the imperialist plot against Tanzania (recently exposed by President Nyerere), and with the plans of Mr. Ian Smith to link up Rhodesia with Fascist Spain and Fascist South Africa.

United States imperialism is the pace-maker in this new counter-revolution. In the first of his series of articles (*Sunday Telegraph* December 6, 1964) 'Mad' Mike Hoare, South African leader of the mercenaries, describes how the American Consulate in Stanleyville was handed over to him as his headquarters after his arrival there. United States military aid to the Congo during the past year has exceeded £3·3 million, and its 'economic aid' in the past two years to no less than £123 million. Because it fears the victory of national liberation would seriously undermine its domination, United States ruling circles are prepared to pay any price, and to engage in all kinds of manoeuvres, trickery and deceit (as well as unlimited bloodshed) to resist its advance.

If it was not clear before, all that has happened since serves to confirm that the landing of Belgian paratroopers used the plight of European hostages merely as a pretext to demonstrate the military strength of the imperialist powers should they find it necessary and opportune to launch a full-scale military invasion of the Congo—and also a warning to other independent states like Tanzania against breaking off the remnants of the imperialist grip in their countries.

The taking of Europeans as hostages was a mild retaliation for the most despicable torture and bloodshed inflicted by mercenary officers and troops from South Africa, Rhodesia, Belgium, Spain, Britain, United States (sending 'Cuban exiles') upon the Congolese people. It is possible that many of the European hostages were not directly involved in the massacre and torture of Africans in the Congo. But neither does it appear that any of them made any effort to criticise or stop the wanton slaughter. In any case, their lives were not in danger until the American planes brought in the Belgian paratroopers. Long before they arrived Christophe Gbenye (Stanleyville liberation leader and former colleague of Lumumba) had made it clear he was in favour of negotiations to save the lives of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European hostages. John Bulloch, *Daily Telegraph* Staff Correspondent in Leopoldville, made the position clear in this despatch:

> Gbenye's efforts to force negotiations are embarrassing and worrying the American Government which, in theory, has no control over military operations by the Congolese Government. (November 20, 1964.)

In answer to an appeal by the International Red Cross for Dr. Carlson's life (accused of being an American spy), Gbenye retorted:

> Before making any proposals, I suggest you should bring back to life all the Congolese massacred by the Americans. We have guaranteed the safety of lives and property, but this does not mean tolerating crime.
>
> (*Daily Telegraph*, November 20, 1964.)

The truth is that the American and Belgian ruling circles did *not* want to save the European hostages by peaceful means. Mr. Jomo Kenyatta, appointed as Chairman of the 'Reconciliation Commission' set up by the Organisation of African Unity, declared that Mr. William Attwood, U.S. Ambassador to Kenya, was against continuing the negotiations for their release and 'stood for force' (*The Times*, November 28, 1964).

The attitude of the Organisation of African Unity (O.A.U.) is made clear in their seven point programme, adopted in Nairobi on November 29:

1. Withdrawal of all foreign mercenaries.
2. A cease-fire among all combatants.
3. Immediate end to foreign intervention.
4. General amnesty for all those involved in the Stanleyville massacres.
5. A round-table conference of all Congolese leaders.
6. Free elections throughout the Congo.
7. O.A.U. fact-finding missions to the Congo and its neighbours.

Mr. Tshombe did not hesitate to reject these proposals as soon as they were made. The U.S. State Department refused to consider them. Nor would the Belgian Government. Even in face of this, the Labour Government in Britain made available the Ascension Island for sending Belgian paratroopers to the Congo.

A big responsibility rests on the organised labour movement to exercise the maximum pressure upon the Wilson Government to disassociate itself from the shameful actions of the governments of the United States and Belgium.

The struggle for freedom and unity in the Congo is inseparable from the struggle for a free and united Africa, and this is equally in the interests of the British people. That is why the demands of the O.A.U. is the platform in Britain for all those who support African freedom.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A REAL ALTERNATIVE TO M.L.F.

Quaestor

IN the famous fourteenth-century collection of travel stories and legends attributed to Sir John Mandeville, there is one with a particularly sinister beginning. It tells how a young man, enamoured of a beautiful girl, was driven to desperation when she died. He broke open her tomb at night and lay with her. Nine months later a voice came to him in his sleep, telling him to go to the tomb and see what he had engendered on his lost love. When he did so, a dreadful dragon broke out of the vault, and proceeded to ravage the country and destroy its people.

The story comes apt to one's memory when looking over the news about the Labour Government's foreign policy, and still more about the central aspect of it—the question of the multilateral nuclear force, which the United States proposed and West Germany is pressing. In 1919 German militarism, essentially, whatever its historical origins, the tool of German monopoly capital, lay shattered and impotent. In their insane hatred of Soviet Russia and fear of Communism in Europe, the governments and capitalists of Britain, France and the U.S.A. rebuilt the military and economic machinery of capitalism in Germany. Even after the dragon had begun to poke its head out of the tomb, they went on feeding it. Finally in 1936-41 it broke loose, and laid waste a great part of Europe and Asia, killing scores of millions in the process. It lay dead in 1945, the guts torn out of it by the Soviet armies on Winston Churchill's own admission—but while the guns were still roaring in Eastern Europe, he himself gave orders to Montgomery to begin collecting them in the West with a view to their possible use by the Germans against the Soviet Union. Thereafter precautions began for the re-engendering of a new German militarist dragon, and for precisely the same reason. Rearmament of West Germany with conventional weapons began in 1953-4, in defiance of public opinion all over western Europe to be followed in 1963-4 by the campaign for her nuclear rearmament.

Oh no, said Mr. Wilson on his return from talks about it with President Johnson. The interview with him, published in *The Times* (December 11, 1964), deserves to be quoted at length. He said that there was now a much firmer agreement that the first aim in all the discussions to strengthen the (Nato) alliance must be to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. 'As far is M.L.F. is concerned, there is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no reason why anybody in this country should be anxious. We have reserved our position on our old proposals and established our position on our new proposals. The one thing we did stress was our strong feeling that whatever was done must not be a proliferation of nuclear weapons, and must not lead to new fingers on the nuclear trigger. We have succeeded in maintaining that position, and we are very gratified at the response we got from our American friends.' Press interpretations of the communique published in the U.S.A. after his talks had been inaccurate. 'I think everyone in this country, in the Labour Party and outside, will welcome a new emphasis we are placing on stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and on moves towards disarmament.' Questioned more closely about the multilateral nuclear fleet proposal, Mr. Wilson said again that he had reserved Britain's position and put forward her own problems. 'But many of our anxieties at some time that there would be an independent starting of a nuclear war without an American veto have been resolved'. In any case, what had been agreed on was 'guide lines for future discussions within the Western Alliance on the European nuclear problem'. The last phrase means that no final decisions have been taken, and that Wilson can bargain with the West Germans if he wants to. But the statement as a whole raises a series of grave doubts—and that notwithstanding the repeated declarations of intent to prevent 'proliferation of nuclear weapons'. These ideas found expression during the Labour Party Conference at Brighton. Despite Mr. Wilson's repudiation of a newspaper story that he had secretly agreed with the President that Britain would join a multilateral nuclear force, which greatly heartened the delegates, he refrained from saying that Britain would not join such a force. Only last year he gave a public warning that a multilateral force would start a nuclear arms race and might fatally lead to a third world war. It is therefore essential to examine Mr. Wilson's interview in detail.

First comes the determination to try and 'strengthen the alliance', *i.e.*, Nato. The alliance was founded on lies about a Soviet menace to western Europe and about the size of Soviet armed forces—exposed, as shown in the October 1963 *Labour Monthly* by the American authorities themselves. On all sides the weakening of Nato today by differences between the French and the West German governments, by the refusal of Canada to enter any multi-lateral force and the doubt about Italy and other powers, by economic difficulties arising in Britain and the U.S.A., and so forth is admit-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ted. Moreover Britain's growing financial dependence on America, as our arms burden under Nato decisions grew, has brought involvement in America's dirty wars in Korea, Vietnam and the Congo. Would it not be more to the point, instead of harping on how to 'strengthen the alliance' and thus increase east-west tension, to take this opportunity of starting to reduce it—by opening discussions with the Soviet Government as it has just offered? (More of this later).*

'We have reserved our position on our old proposals and established our position on our new proposals.' *The Times* gave a useful summary of both sets on December 11. Both old and new proposals, however, blandly ignore the essential point—that of German *access* to nuclear weapons, whether as part of an allied command or in any other way.

Mr. Wilson thought he had met that point. 'Whatever was done must not be a proliferation of nuclear weapons, and must not lead to new fingers on the nuclear trigger.' *But proliferation does not necessarily depend on whether there are German fingers on the trigger.* Although (according to *The Times* Bonn correspondent the same day) 'Mr. Wilson was anxious to dispel any impression that he was labouring under the specific fear of a German finger on the nuclear trigger', that is precisely the fear of hundreds of millions of people all over the world. But *the 'trigger' concerned need not be an American H-bomb.* Proliferation can come, and is bound to come, as has been repeatedly pointed out in this journal since July 1963, through the ex-Nazi military leaders, scientists and technicians of West Germany (and their backers the industrial magnates) getting access to nuclear *secrets.* On this point a *Tass* statement on November 14, was most specific. It should be recorded here, since practically all the capitalist press in Britain has done its best to hush up this part of the statement:

> The participation of the Federal Republic of Germany in the Nato multilateral force would clearly make it easier to accomplish the task of the West German militarists, who are dying to obtain access to nuclear weapons. Forging ahead and creating their own nuclear rocket force by their own individual efforts is one thing, but obtaining access to the well-developed nuclear rocket weapons of the United States through a 'multilateral' Nato force is quite a different matter. Those who claim that there would be no direct transfer of nuclear rocket weapons to the 'national possession' of any of the participants in the Nato nuclear force are actually evading the essence of the matter, which is that in this way a possibility will be created for the West German revenge-seekers to obtain from Ameri-

*A striking pamphlet on this question, *The Nato Sheet Anchor*, by Terence Heelas, has just been issued by Labour C.N.D. at 9d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> can sources both the necessary secret data about nuclear weapons and the weapons themselves . . . Plants in the Federal Republic of Germany are already manufacturing certain types of rocket weapons on the basis of documents obtained in the United States. And with the help of the multilateral nuclear force, the West German militarists would like to obtain access to the latest types of nuclear weapons and to secrets concerning the manufacture of nuclear weapons. With West German science and production at its present level of development, it would not be very difficult for the Federal Republic, in that case, to create its own nuclear weapons. Then the West German militarists would not have to carry out tests of nuclear weapons because the weapons have already been tested on American testing grounds.

What guarantee do either the old proposals or the new proposals give against proliferation in *this* way? None whatsoever—and Mr. Wilson knows it.

'Many of our anxieties at some time that there would be an independent starting of a nuclear war without an American veto have been resolved.' But what if West Germany finds itself—under a Christian-Democrat or Free-Democrat or Social-Democrat Government (all of them officially supporting the M.L.F. project, the S.D.P. at its latest Congress in December)—equipped by this means with nuclear weapons, *outside* the whole veto machinery? Does Mr. Wilson imagine that the Pentagon would not support what the West Germans themselves call the 'Bonntagon'—the supposedly non-existent German General Staff—in that event?

But supposing the American veto is maintained, and West German generals and politicians accept it: what does that mean for Britain, if not putting her very existence finally and irrevocably under the control of the United States generals and politicians? The mere suggestion has brought the Tories into a furious campaign to retain Britain's right to withdraw, either from the M.L.F. or the A.N.F., when her national policies require. Well, but what is to prevent the West Germans claiming the same right—once they have learned all there is to learn from membership of either organisation. Mr. Wilson's anxieties may have been 'resolved'—but only at the price of still greater perils.

The truth is that, in pursuing the will of the wisp of a stronger Nato in the nuclear (or any other field), Mr. Wilson is trying to reconcile the irreconcileable—the interests of British and German imperialism on the one hand, and the interests of United States imperialism and of the deepest aspirations and interests of the British people on the other.

The fact is that in the sphere of foreign relations a Labour Prime Minister in Britain is not fatally bound to follow, even with lagging

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

footsteps, where America leads—any more than de Gaulle is.

This particularly is true at the present time, when there is a clear alternative available, leading away from the servitude, perils and humiliations open or concealed in the policies discussed at Washington. Yes, there is such an alternative—and it is all the more pressing because many of its ingredients have been approved by the labour movement itself (including the leaders of the Labour Party). It was put forward by Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, in a memorandum at the United Nations 19th General Assembly on December 7, which the Soviet Government was willing to discuss 'in any form and at any level, including the summit'.

The following were its proposals:

1. Reciprocal reduction by 10-15 per cent of the military budgets of the stronger Powers—and the use of part of the resources thus released for aiding developing countries. (The U.S.S.R. has set the example by a further cut of nearly 4 per cent after last year's cut).
2. Withdrawal of all foreign troops to their own national frontiers—or a beginning of such withdrawals.
3. Dismantling of foreign military bases in other people's countries—thus consolidating the independence of the young States of Africa, Asia and Latin America.
4. An international agreement not to spread nuclear weapons, directly or indirectly through military alliances.
5. An international conference to sign an agreement prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons.
6. Nuclear-free zones in Central Europe, Northern Europe, the Balkans, Africa, the Indian Ocean, the Middle East and elsewhere—beginning with a 'nuclear weapons freeze' in Central Europe, as proposed by Poland (and by a Labour Party memorandum in January 1964).
7. A timetable (priorities) for the destruction of bomber aircraft of different types.
8. An agreement without delay to ban underground nuclear tests, using means of detection already in existence.
9. A comprehensive system of collective security in Europe, based on pooling the efforts of all European countries and the U.S.A.—and, as a first step, a non-agression pact between the Nato and Warsaw Treaty countries.
10. Measures to reduce the peril of surprise attack, including abandonment of nuclear weapons in both parts of Germany, withdrawal of foreign armed forces from all European States, and establishment of observation posts on Nato and Warsaw Treaty countries.
11. Agreement to cut the numbers of armed forces.
12. Mutually acceptable forms of control over the implementation of these measures.

Would not Harold Wilson be better employed in discussing these proposals with the Soviet Government than in trying to steer between the whirlpools of Washington and the rocks of Bonn?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR AND THE TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION

John Eaton

THE Labour Government has assumed office at a time of profound crisis in British society and, clearly, what happens—or does not happen—in this period, may well determine Britain's future for many years to come. Of fundamental importance in this crisis is the technological revolution that human society is now beginning to undergo—a revolution that is still young but rapidly gathering momentum and of which the social consequences will be every bit as far reaching as those of the industrial revolution.

The impact of the new powers of science upon warfare and international relations is already clear to see, but this revolution is also marching deep into the domestic life of every human society. For Britain its impact is at this juncture of time particularly sharp. Chaos in transport, failures in town planning, the crisis in education and a hundred other symptoms declare the inability of the old ruling class to cope with the issues of the time; but most of all there is an awareness that this old industrial country, the home of many of the world's greatest inventors, technicians and scientists, has signally failed to turn advancing human knowledge into advancing economic strength.

Marx laid the foundations for a scientific analysis of the laws of motion of modern society. The concepts he developed make more intelligible to us what is now happening. Taking the broader view of the social panorama, one sees that the productive relations that science is creating are altogether out of tune with the productive relations of a capitalist, private ownership, market economy. The problem we face today in Britain is where and how to join battle against the forces of the past and help guide the course of the gigantic changes that are about to take place.

It is evident that under modern conditions the issues of the class struggle involve a good deal more than questions of wages and conditions of work at factory level, whilst, however, it is the people at the point of production that remain the major driving force of social progress. Monopoly price policy, inflation, government tax policies, etc., can partly counteract wage gains. Moreover, even if the aspects of the class struggle concerned with the workers' share of their product were alone to be considered, these issues would under the conditions of today present themselves also as struggles about

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the division of the national income considered as a whole, supplementing to a greater degree than in the past the struggles over wages and conditions at the point of production. There are however—and today in particular—many wider issues which the workers' movement cannot evade; and a multiplicity of such issues is, as it were, brought together under the broader question of how the labour movement is to react and meet the technological revolution.

The tactics to be followed by the enemies of socialism and social progress are already becoming evident. The power of the labour movement's enemies is centred in the economic power of monopoly groupings linked to a world-wide nexus of capitalist finance and international trusts. The most direct expression of their power is economic; but it is also buttressed by their attachment to the top hierarchies of the established order and opinion-forming organisms. Labour's enemies hope by use of economic pressure to dictate to the government what it is and is not to do. It is imperative that the labour movement should not allow itself to be diverted by this pressure from its longer term aims of social and economic modernisation. Moreover this modernisation will be bogus unless carried out by the people in a manner that is attentive to the interests of the people—and in particular the productive workers. The Labour Government must be ready to use foreign exchange and trade controls to escape current threats of balance of payments crises; for this same reason and also to help domestic development, it must break away from imperialist extravagancies that have shaped Britain's foreign and military policy up to the present, and a similar determination not to be obstructed by reactionary interests must inform its home economic policy if any progress is to be made towards the goal of modernisation. It needs no deep analysis for socialists to see that financier monopolist ownership and control of the key economic resources is the main obstacle to the fullest use of science in the service of social aims and needs.

To assist the democratic forces to find out concretely which are the main obstacles that need first to be removed, it is important to concentrate popular support behind specific concrete tasks. In fighting for feasible projects of economic advance the people will learn where the difficulties lie and who are their enemies. The workers and technicians, on whose activity the functioning of the key sectors in Britain's economy depend, should in each organisation consider how progress can be made in the concrete circumstances of that organisation. But in order to do this, the trade unions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and other democratic organisations need to give much discussion to the significance of this second industrial revolution that is about to affect their lives so deeply. In Britain, in my view, it is possible for workers' organisations to control the impact of the technological revolution in a way that has not so far been possible for the workers' organisations of the U.S.A. 'Why is it' said Walter Reuther in a speech to the United Auto Workers in 1961 'that automation's bright promise of abundance and creative leisure has been transmuted into the nightmarish mockery of mountainous inventories of unsold goods and the barren corroding idleness of unemployment?' How serious the impact of unemployment is, is evident from the following quotation:

> Doctor Gerhard Colm of the National Planning Association has calculated that 5,600,000 new jobs would have to be created during 1963 in order to cut the unemployment rate to four per cent by the end of the year. . . . Of this estimate 1,500,000 were 'replacement jobs' to absorb the workers who would be displaced by mechanisation, other technological changes and improved organisation and management.
>
> (Page 7, *Unemployment and the American Economy*, editor Arthur M. Ross, University of California.)

In Britain, in order to make social advance, a great development of our power to produce wealth is needed, but, at the same time, the indispensable condition of economic as well as social advance is to see that the capacities of more and more people are more and more fully used, both in social production and in the greater leisure which the scientific revolution could provide for all. That 'modernisation' should mean throwing anyone on to the scrap heap of unemployment cannot be tolerated by the labour movement.

In order to deal with the situation facing the British economy it is necessary to see how deep going the present technological revolution is and to consider what is its essential character. As steam power was an important ancillary to the first industrial revolution, so nuclear power, coupled with the possibility it provides of transforming materials, is a most important ancillary of our present revolution. It is, however, no more than ancillary to a process of which the essence is to be sought in the computer, feed back mechanisms and, in general, 'cybernation'—and to all these developments the electronics industry serves as an indispensable pre-requisite. As in 1800 the tool served to replace routine motions of the human hand, the electronic apparatus which we may generically call 'computers', serves today to replace routine procedures of the human brain and so can itself take over any function of control and analysis that can be specified with complete logical precision. Once the rules

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

according to which machines are to be operated can be specified with precision, their control and co-ordination, by means of cybernation, can be carried out without workers to act as machine operators and co-ordinators. The 'instruments' of man change from being individual machines to whole units of production. Where such control apparatus can be introduced it takes over jobs previously performed by whole teams of workers. Hitherto the main application of these new techniques have been in large scale organisations with homogeneous problems of wide incidence. Such organisations have been able to spend extravagantly on the introduction of new methods. But now improved methods of preparing data imput and cheaper electronic 'hardware' will make feasible the introduction of these new techniques into almost every branch of economic activity.

The job is to use this great power to raise productivity and improve the conditions of work; to use it so as to enrich human society and expand the capabilities of each individual in a productive cultured community of free and equal human beings. But none of this will happen automatically—as witness the experience to date of monopoly dominated automation in the U.S.A. It will happen only in so far as working people understand the issues at stake and through their organisations, beginning at factory and local authority level, determine to shape the course of events themselves. This means putting the social aims and social interests of the people before the private property interests of the monopolies. It means being ready to remove the obstructions caused by private ownership of means of production. The Wilson Government is pledged to modernise Britain and the Minister in charge of modernisation is a respected trade unionist and an outstanding fighter against the military abuse of science; he is flanked by scientists well-known as champions of progressive causes. Also throughout Britain's scientific institutions and at many points within industry too, there are many who are eager to play a part in the modernisation of our economic and social life. But little discussion has yet taken place about where the workers—not just their representatives or leaders—are to come in, how in each plant and factory, each institution and public authority, the workers on the job are to shape and control the economic and social transformation—all that the 'modernisation of Britain' implies. That the 'man on the job' and the 'organisation on the job' must come in, is a political and practical necessity. No Government can snap its fingers at the entrenched power of capitalism—whether its majority be four, forty or one hundred and forty—unless it has the conscious and ready support of the organised workers and the organ-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ised technicians. The only power greater than the economic (and political) power of capital is the economic (and political) power of the organised productive workers. The problem is how to mobilise this power as the engine of economic and social change.

What is economic modernisation? It is not just Whitehall plans! It involves the whole battle against monopoly. It requires change carried out in particular plants and factories by individual human beings. The cutting edge of progress must be individual organisations which introduce better ways of doing things—economically and socially. If the dream of a new Britain is ever to become real, this can only mean every trade union and every shop steward's committee actively studying possibilities of making changes and fighting for changes in which the interests of the masses are protected by the participation of people who actually work in the factories or live in the boroughs and counties where the changes are taking place. Central plans can only be a framework.

The struggle for the social modernisation of Britain (which, as the Labour programme brings out, implies economic modernisation as its basis) necessitates a struggle against monopoly capitalism (and of this the Labour campaign has as yet to make the British people aware). However the point is that every socialist, every progressive in the labour movement needs to seize hold of the positive objectives to which the victory of the Labour Party in the General Election opens a way, and to fight for these objectives concretely; that is to give life to the aims of national policy in terms of the actual circumstances in each factory and each local authority. The reformist dangers of the Labour programme can be countered only by the activity of organised movements of the people fighting for the carrying through of the aims of the programme in which they believe. Central planning becomes real only in so far as it has local roots. The fight for nationalisation will become real as a fight against specific obstructions by private property interests. Economic growth in Britain cannot follow an 'easy' path after the fashion of the French or German 'economic miracles'. All real social and economic modernisation must involve a stubborn fight against vested property interests. The fight for modernisation will make the fight for socialism real and concrete, an issue that the people will understand before and as a stepping stone to more general political demands for public ownership and planning. The opportunity that organised labour in Britain must attempt to seize is that of putting itself in command of the technological revolution that is to transform social life in Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MODERN AGRICULTURE UNDER CAPITALISM

Jurgen Kuczynski

[*We are very pleased to print this month an article dealing with the modern transformation in agriculture in the capitalist world. The article is part of a series of lectures delivered by Professor Kuczynski in Cuba. A second article will deal with agriculture under socialism.—Ed.*, L.M.]

DURING the major part of human history, productivity increased probably more in agriculture than in industry. Surplus product, more production per person than is absolutely necessary for keeping a person alive and able to work, developed first in agriculture. The development of exploitation and of a ruling class which does not have to do manual work are the result of increased productivity in agriculture. Only during the industrial revolution, with the development of capitalism, did productivity in the production of non-agricultural commodities increase more than agricultural productivity. This process, beginning in England during the second half of the eighteenth century, lasted until about 1940, that is almost 200 years. More and more, agricultural productivity lagged behind industrial productivity, but Marx foresaw that a change in that situation would come about and that productivity in agriculture would increase again more than in industry, and later again, productivity in both would progress about equally.

To examine the development of productivity in agriculture and industry, let us look at the United States of America, which was the first country in which agricultural productivity took a great leap forward. But firstly, let us examine the period of slow development of productivity in U.S. agriculture:

*Harvest yields in the U.S.A., 1866 to 1940**
(*bushels per acre*)

Years	Wheat	Rye	Maize	Oats
1866-1875	12.3	10.8	25.6	26.5
1876-1885	13.0	11.6	26.2	27.5
1886-1895	13.7	12.6	25.4	26.8
1896-1905	13.9	13.1	27.2	29.8
1906-1915	14.9	13.5	27.0	29.1
1916-1925	13.5	12.6	26.6	30.7
1926-1935	13.7	11.6	23.9	27.7
1936-1940	13.8	11.8	25.9	30.2

*Statistical abstract of the United States, Washington, D.C., 1946 and 1958.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The table shows the really astonishing fact· that yields per acre have practically stagnated for three-quarters of a century.

Of course this does not mean that the total amount harvested has not increased considerably—as the cultivated area increased considerably. Wheat harvests increased during the period from 1866-75 to 1936-40 about threefold, those of maize and rye did more than double, the oat harvest was at the latter date about four times as high as at the former.

The stagnation in the yield per acre did not mean either that agricultural productivity remained stagnant, as fewer people were needed to get the same yield per acre. But the stagnation meant that the development of productivity in agriculture lagged behind that in industry, as the following table shows:

*The development of productivity per worker in U.S. industry and agriculture, 1843 to 1941 (1900=100)**

Business Cycles	Industry	Agriculture
1843-1848	34	52
1849-1858	37	56
1859-1867	41	50
1868-1878	58	62
1878-1885	72	77
1885-1897	86	84
1897-1908	104	100
1908-1914	116	97
1915-1921	127	106
1922-1933	187	124
1933-1941†	237	141

We see that productivity in industry increased during the second half of the nineteenth century by about 200 per cent, and in agriculture only about 100 per cent; progress in industrial productivity was about twice as much as in agriculture. During the first two-fifths of the twentieth century the difference between the development of productivity in industry and agriculture became even sharper: productivity in agriculture increased by about 40 per cent, productivity in industry by almost 140 per cent, about three and a half times as much.

For the years since 1889 we have another interesting computation,

*J. Kuczynski. Die Geschichte der Lage der Arbeiter in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika seit 1898. Berlin 1955, p. 122 f. and Studien zur Geschichte der Weltwirtschaft. Berlin 1952, p. 108, as well as the sources given there.

†No cycle.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

showing the development of productivity per hour in agriculture and in all other branches of economy:*

	Productivity per hour		
Years	Agriculture	Years	'Non-Agriculture'
1889	77.0	1889	41.1
1899/1903	87.2	1899	52.8
1909/13	88.8	1909	64.7
1919/23	91.5	1919	79.7
1929/33	100.9	1929	100.0
1937/41	119.7	1937	116.4

Here we see how agriculture lagged not only behind industry but behind all other economic activity.

In the course of the second world war, with U.S. agricultural products in greatest demand, a technical revolution took place in agriculture and the situation changed completely. Suddenly, after about 80 years of stagnation, yields per acre increase rapidly, rising about 100 per cent in wheat and maize, not much less for rye and about 50 per cent for oats. We enter a new stage of the development of agricultural productivity. And how did productivity develop if we compare industry and agriculture?

Development of productivity per worker in U.S. industry and agriculture 1933-1962 (1900=100)†

Years	Industry	Agriculture
1933-41	237	141
1942-45	280	179
1945-54	305	224
1955-59	372	349
1960	409	405
1961	427	435
1962	445	451

The rise in agricultural productivity is unique in history. Since 1933-41, productivity in agriculture has risen about two and a half times as much as in industry. All the lagging behind of agricultural productivity since 1900 has disappeared. As compared with 1900 the rise in productivity is about the same in agriculture and industry; and in the not too distant future we will be able to say: from the middle of the eighteenth century to the present, the rise in productivity in industry and agriculture—though their development was very, very uneven—was about equal.

*John W. Kendrick, ***Productivity Trends in the United States.*** NBER, Princeton 1961.

†See Historical Statistics of the United States 1789-1945, Washington, D.C., 1949; Historical Statistics of the United States. Colonial Times to 1957. Washington, D.C., 1960; statistical abstract of the United States, 1963.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As always in exploiter-societies, progress took place at the expense of the people. The number of small farmers' families expropriated in the United States of America shows the following table computed from the figures given in the official U.S. Abstract of Statistics:

from 1940 to 1950	700,000
from 1950 to 1960	1,700,000

Over two and a half million farmers have lost their land, their machinery, their homestead, their occupation between 1940 and 1963! To this must be added the fact, that the indebtedness of the vast majority of the remaining small and middle farmers has increased very much and that many of them face ruin in the near future.

The rapid rise in agricultural productivity is mainly due to an intensive use of machinery and to the widespread application of chemical products. Let us first look at the use of machinery in agriculture:

Value of agricultural instruments and machinery 1920 to 1960, at fixed prices† in 1,000 million dollars*

Year	$	Year	$
1920	3.6	1950	11.2
1930	3.3	1955	16.2
1940	3.1	1960	18.4

What a boring story this table tells for the years from 1920 to 1940. There was practically no change in the use of machinery. And then the sudden jump from 1940 to 1960, about a sixfold increase in the use of machinery! And the history of the use of chemical fertilisers is just the same. Again practically no change between 1920 and 1940, and a rapid increase, threefold this time, between 1940 and 1960.

If we compare the increase in the use of instruments and machinery per employed person in industry and agriculture, taking 1940 equal 100, we get the following figures:

Year	Industry	Agriculture
1940	100	100
1950	142	278
1955	160	377
1960	185	427

The use of instruments and machinery per employed person has increased since 1940 in agriculture almost four times as much as in industry: in industry an increase of 85 per cent, in agriculture an increase of 327 per cent!

---

*Historical Statistics, l.c. and Statistical Abstract of the United States.

†Up to 1938 deflated on the basis of the Bureau of Labour Statistics index of wholesale prices of metals and metal products; since 1938 the index of wholesale prices of machinery was used.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One may get the impression from the foregoing that the technical revolution in agriculture has taken place mainly in the raising of crops. But it is equally important in the raising of livestock and the gaining and processing of livestock products (milk, butter, cheese, eggs, etc.). The raising of poultry has in fact become an activity which leaves more and more the rural districts and migrates into the city. The foremost economic weekly in the capitalist world, the English *Economist*, March 14, 1964, commenting on chicken raising in England speaks quite justly of 'factory farming' and of 'new concrete, fieldless farms'. It also speaks of 'mass production and automation applied to animal rearing'.

And then it describes the situation:

> What made this kind of factory farming possible was the discovery of methods for accelerating the growth of animals and combining them with big savings in labour. Highly concentrated scientific feeding . . . provides the means of growth; bulk handling of this food provides the labour saving. But there is a third element that gives the factory farm its unpleasant aspect. To get fast growth no exercise must be allowed to dissipate this necessarily expensive nourishment. Animals 'do' best, in the sense of most rapidly converting feed into saleable meat, if they are confined in the smallest possible space within which they can stand and lie down and grow . . . and grow . . . and grow. The farm becomes an assembly of buildings within which the beasts spend their lives, where they can be stocked at many times the density possible in an open field and where feeding and cleaning are handled mechanically, with the minimum of labour. . . . Chickens lend themselves ideally to this kind of rearing, because they stay reasonably healthy under unbelievably crowded conditions. Nearly 27 per cent of the laying fowls in this country are now kept in batteries, i.e. small laying cages, holding from one to four birds and stacked in tiers four or five high like so many luggage lockers. Another 56 per cent are kept on deep litter, again closely crowded in sheds but not caged like the battery bird. This and the intensive production of broiler chickens were British agriculture's first real introduction to the factory farm.

Now let us look at the following table, giving some fundamental facts of the development of U.S. agriculture:

*Development of crop agriculture, 1916 to 1960**
(1947/49 = 100)

Years	Area under cultivation	Area Harvested	Yields Per Acre	Total Harvest	Productivity per worker
1916/25	96	100	79	76	49
1926/35	100	99	77	77	52
1936/40	98	95	82	80	61

*Wheat, rye, maize, oats, sugar, cotton, potatoes, vegetables, tobacco, etc. Sources: Historical Statistics, l.c. and Statistical Abstract of the United States.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1936/45	98	97	88	86	69
1946/55	100	98	101	101	116
1956/60	95	92	120	114	194
1956	97	91	109	106	161
1957	95	91	112	106	180
1958	94	92	126	118	203
1959	95	92	123	117	203
1960	93	92	130	122	222
change from 1916/25 to 1956/60	−1%	−8%	+53%	+49%	+296%

The area under cultivation and the area harvested have declined. The total harvest has during the period of the technical revolution in agriculture increased by little more than one-fifth! No wonder that employment has developed as follows:

Millions of employed, 1920 to 1960†

Year	Agriculture	Industry
1920	11.4	10.5
1930	10.4	9.4
1940	9.5	10.8
1950	7.5	15.0
1955	6.7	16.6
1960	5.7	16.4

In 1920 the number of employed in agriculture was slightly higher than that in industry. In 1940 the number employed in agriculture was somewhat lower than that employed in industry. In 1960 almost three times as many people were employed in industry as in agriculture.

The agricultural workers and peasants (farmers) employed in modern agricultural activity today are very different from those in past times and often are really not to be distinguished any more from industrial workers. Their skill becomes the skill of the industrial worker and with the closing of the gulf between town and country through modern transportation, with the transplantation of many social urban institutions to the country, with the necessity to acquire high technical and chemical skill in agricultural work and with the transfer also of a growing number of scientists into the country, the ideologies of the agriculturally and industrially employed become similar to a greater and greater extent.

This is a fact of the greatest political importance. It becomes easier to form a united front of rural and urban working people against capitalism, against the monopolies, against imperialism. Thus the change in agriculture, the creation of modern, of mechanised and chemicised agriculture favours our side in the class struggle.

†Historical Statistics, l.c. and Statistical Abstract of the U.S.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

IN HONOUR OF BERNAL

The Science of Science

Edited by Maurice Goldsmith and Alan Mackay

Souvenir Press Ltd. 236 pp. 30s.

DO NOT BE put off by the title of this book which suggests some abstract philosophy as esoteric as Christian science or theosophy. Nothing of the sort. This is an important, useful work in the form of a collection of essays contributed by eminent scientists, most of whom are widely known for their progressive stand on questions of science and society. They include such familiar names as Burhop, Blackett, Kapitsa, Haldane, Needham, Pirie, Synge, Snow and, of course, Bernal. The book owes its special character, however, to having been produced in honour of J. D. Bernal and to commemorate the publication of his epoch-making work, *The Social Function of Science*, a quarter of a century ago. It is fitting that such a tribute should be paid him for his brilliant researches and fertile ideas in the most varied scientific fields and the influence of his thinking on a whole generation of scientists. It is also a recognition of the value of his firmly based, creative Marxist approach to all the problems of science and society. As C. P. Snow says in the first essay (a characteristic study entitled 'A Personal Portrait'), for Bernal 'Marxism is the one system which, to him, makes sense of the world as it is and as he has struggled for it to become'. One of the most readable and forthright essays in the book is the final contribution by Bernal himself, in which he gives his own summing up of the developments that have taken place and the problems ahead. In so doing he does not fail to stress that 'the technical possibilities and integrated control that can be achieved . . . cannot be fitted into the fragmented social frame of private interests and exploitation', and that 'the scientific and computer age is necessarily a Socialist one'.

This realisation, however, is by no means so clearly expressed in several of the essays dealing with particular aspects of the progress of science. The authors show how Bernal's ideas and proposals have come to fruition. They note the scientific and technical revolution of our time, which Bernal forecast, and the importance of which is now a commonplace. But, in order to be constructive, they attach insufficient weight to the obstacles to progress. 'The way is clear for rational and informed planning . . . of science', says D. J. Price, Professor of Yale University. But a planned economy, and planned science as well, however fashionable now as a catchword, remain an illusion as long as capitalism persists.

No less than three essays, two of them by Nobel prize-winners P. M. S. Blackett and C. F. Powell, deal with the rôle of science in the newly developing countries and the problem of the huge disparity in living standards between the rich and poor countries. These essays contain a wealth of valuable information, but it is this disparity that is regarded, for instance by Blackett, as the 'major challenge' and 'source of discord in the modern world', and not the continued existence of capitalism, which is taken for granted.

Even the critical essay by N. W. Pirie on the 'Maldistribution of Research Effort', while pointing out that, possibly, scientists are 'foolishly and extravagantly used' complacently concludes that in Britain, as regards basic human requirements, 'the dis-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tribution of research effort is criticizable in matters of detail only'.

A wider outlook is that of Professor Burhop, who writes on 'Scientists and Public Affairs', and especially on the social responsibility of scientists. The fact that, in general, scientists are still regarded as 'back-room boys' who should be 'on tap but not on top' is partly due to the lack of social consciousness of the scientists themselves, who also docilely acquiesce in the exploitation of their talents for anti-social purposes and war. This situation is changing, as can be seen from Burhop's description of the rise of such bodies as the World Federation of Scientific Workers and the Pugwash Conferences.

The editors were fortunate in being able to include a paper from J. B. S. Haldane on the social application of knowledge of human genetics, which he completed after leaving hospital and must be one of his last writings.

Another article of special interest is that on 'Science and Society in the East and West' by Joseph Needham, who draws an illuminating contrast between the aristocratic, military feudalism of Europe and the civilian, mandarin-headed state feudalism of medieval China, which had never used slave labour and therefore encouraged labour-saving inventions. The influence of science and technology on the development of society is now generally admitted, but Needham shows how the reverse is also true.

Many other problems and suggestions are raised in these articles. The 'research revolution', as Bernal calls it, is going on faster and faster. But its results are very small compared to what they could be. It is in this sense that Bernal showed the need for a wide-ranging study of the means of advance, a study that could be called the science of science. But, however necessary, this cannot be effective as long as science and scientists are in the service of capitalism. 'The powers of ignorance and greed distort science and lead it astray for war and destructive ends', says Bernal. That bondage must be ended.

CLEMENS DUTT.

ETYMOLOGY OF NEO-COLONIALISM

Neo-Colonialism
Brian Crozier
Bodley Head. 112 pp. 10s. 6d.

THIS WOULD-BE SEMI-OFFICIAL answer to the charge of neo-colonialism by a lecturer of the Royal Institute of International Affairs and for the B.B.C., previously of the staff of the *Economist,* consists of the usual ill-informed and pompously illiterate hash customary from these exalted quarters when dealing with Marxist views.

The standard of information can be gathered from the statement on p. 8 that the borders of the Soviet Union 'correspond with those of the Tsarist Empire'—oblivious of the fact that the independence of Finland, refused by Kerensky, was granted by Lenin immediately after the Bolshevik revolution, in accordance with the principle of self-determination, including the right of secession. Similarly this worthy author alleges that it was only after the socialist revolution that Lenin was 'made aware of a factor he had tended to dismiss as of no importance: nationalism'—again oblivious of all the voluminous writings and polemics of Lenin on the national question long before the socialist revolution, and his ceaseless tirades against those trends in West European social democracy which ignored the significance of the national question.

However, this book would not be worth reviewing save for one odd

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question raised. The author sets himself at the outset the problem: 'What interests us is how the term "neo-colonialism" came into use?' His answer to this query is to refer to 'the unknown back-room genius in the Kremlin who coined the term'. Beyond this blandly anonymous assumption he makes no attempt to seek for the answer to his own problem.

The analysis of the new tactics of imperialism in the modern era of the advance of national liberation can be traced in Marxist discussion right through the 1950s onwards. But where and when did the term 'Neo-Colonialism' first come into use? In the second edition of my *Crisis of Britain and the British Empire,* written in 1956 and published in the beginning of 1957, I find that I suggested that a new term was necessary to describe these new tactics of imperialism, and tentatively offered as a new term 'The New Colonialism'. 'It is necessary to recognise that in the more recent period of imperialist policy a new technique has been evolved and elaborated and more and more widely used, which might be termed the "New Colonialism".' (p. 156.) In the course of translation into various languages this became 'Le neo-colonialisme' or 'Das Neokolonialismus'. It would thus appear that at the date when this was written, in 1956, the term was not yet a familiar one and was even offered somewhat diffidently as a possible new coinage. Perhaps some diligent reader may be able to offer an earlier example of its origin? Until then, this citation may possibly be a candidate for its earlier use, and in any case an answer to our author's customary facile assumption that this term was coined as a 'Russian plot' in the Kremlin.

R.P.D.

William Morris: The Man and the Myth

R. Page Arnot

Lawrence & Wishart, 1964. 132 pp. 15s.

DURING THE LAST few weeks I have had the experience of reading two entirely different books, both of which take as their foundations a work issued in the mid-thirties, which profoundly influenced me at an impressionable age. In one case the new version had the attraction of a period piece, from a period which may not appeal to readers today. Robin Page Arnot's *William Morris,* in its new dress, is as fresh as was the original booklet—*A Vindication*—in 1934. Why is this? A great deal is due to the quality of Morris himself: the closer one gets to the truth of Morris' personality and views the more alive they become. More than a little is due to the author; the sparkle of the following passage is Arnot at his best: 'Morris did not become a literary socialist or an artistic socialist, or any other kind of middle-class parody of a socialist. Morris became a revolutionary socialist'. The lasting quality of this study of Morris is because it is Marxist. In 1934 Arnot cut through 'an orgy of "canonization",' to restore the true outlines of the life and work of the greatest artist of nineteenth century England. The measure of his achievement is that, in spite of much later scholarship—usefully summarised in an Appendix to the new work—in particular E. P. Thompson's vast work, the outline of 1934 stands up today.

But this is to give a false impression, for Arnot has in fact rewritten completely the four chapters which cover similar ground to the booklet of 1934. New is the full text of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Morris's anti-war Manifesto of 1877 and of another 'On the Sudan War' of 1885—both rich in lessons for leaflet writers today. There is much more about the Socialist League, and every sentence has clearly been reweighed and many refashioned. To these four chapters have been added two long chapters in which the full texts of some fifty of Morris's letters —to J. L. Mahon and to Dr. John Glasse—are printed with a developing commentary on the times. The letters to Mahon are printed for the first time. Most of those to Glasse were printed in *Labour Monthly* and sold in an offprint in 1951. But there are new letters, among them references to Morris's participation in an Edinburgh Art Congress. Morris never made the mistake of some intellectual 'revolutionaries', cutting himself off from the 'bourgeois' organisations in which he was already known and confining himself to 'politics'. But he found the task wearisome: 'Imagine one in the chair hour after hour listening to men teaching their grandmother to suck eggs, and I on my good behaviour too!'

The letters to Mahon and Glasse concern details, the details of organising an infant revolutionary movement and the conflicts of personality and policies which inevitably arise. They are full of lessons for us, in two particulars, for they deal primarily with the problems of unity and schism in the socialist movement and with the attitude of Socialists to 'parliamentary action'. The very fact that the conditions in the 1880s were totally different to those of today and that Morris took what would appear, at a superficial glance, to be the opposite of the Communist position today is what makes the study of these details so important. For only from such study can one learn the necessary historical approach which makes sense of the changing tactics of working-class struggle.

In a sense Arnot has given us two books in one: a vital long essay on Morris, and a documented monograph study of a particular period. We owe him a considerable debt, not least for the skill with which he has woven the two together.

LIONEL MUMBY.

Appearing January 14

MY LIFE WITH THE MINERS

Abe Moffat

Abe Moffat went down the pit at fourteen and has been continuously associated with the Scottish miners ever since—for nineteen years as their President. These memoirs of a Communist miner, whose incorruptible staunchness has won the respect even of enemies, contribute a notable chapter to the history of our time.

42s.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INSPIRATION

JUST before the American Elections we received a letter from Bertha Howe, a veteran friend of *Labour Monthly*, who looks back on a lifetime of courageous campaigning for progressive ideas in the United States. We think our readers would appreciate some of her comments on the eve of her 98th Birthday.

'I try to visualise your small island', she writes, 'with the ups and downs of its colonial relationships and the fact that these struggles took place in a class economy, and I am filled with admiration of your fighters for peace and justice. Your class situation is very different from ours—the trade unionist here can quickly see where his interest lies now that the advent of Goldwaterism shows that there *is* a difference between the two parties. . . . The stressing of Communism as the enemy is now mostly an echo and reports of successful meetings held by the American Institute of Marxist Study are very encouraging. The *Worker*, too, has considerable circulation amongst city workers.'

Bertha Howe's clear thinking and shrewd appraisal of the American scene are obviously not at all impaired by her years, and we are proud to count her as one of our staunchest supporters—a reader of *LM* since the start and a generous contributor to our Fund. Another veteran friend, showing his appreciation practically, writes 'I like your resurrection of the sayings of the Socialist prophets (p. 553, December 1964). They should be an inspiration to the young'.

Readers old and young, your letters and gifts are an inspiration to *us*.

Helen Falber.

£49. 15s. 5d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: H.L. (U.S.A.), £5; H. Brindle, 5s; L. Bates, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 3s; Oldham Branch, 2s; B. W. Mackay, 10s; S. Morrissy, £1; D. J. Perry, 2s 6d; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 3s; Southend Branch, 12s 6d; Ben Ainley, 10s; 'Humphreys family', 5s; 'In memory of Joe Brien', 3s; G.I., 2s 6d; R.F.B., £3; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; 'S. Mill', £1; L'Humanité (plus extra gift), 10s; A. Corbett, £1; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; the Butcher family, 10s; S. Townsend, 12s 6d; E. Sheldon, 10s; Two Tynesiders, 5s 6d; R. McLeod, 5s; R. Dodd, £1; F.G.A. (Canada), £1; 'Pax', 5s; Nellie Usher, 2s 6d; 'Oliver Twist and Friends', 15s; E.J.B., 10s; Socialist Sailor, £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.
OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: E. Midgley, 10s; J. Smith, 3s 6d; E. Love, £5; A. G. G. (Canada), £1; E. J. Wray, 5s; Finchley Branch, 7s 6d; F. Lehane, £3 19s; W. Wallace, £3 19s; M. Philibert (Extra), 2s 6d; J. Slater, 19s; J. Jowett, 19s; J. Lester, 9s; T. Russell, 4s; F. Rogers, 9s; H. Sherwen, £1 1s; F. H. Marshall, 4s 6d; J. M. Sinclair, 8s; L. H., 4s 6d; J. M. Higgington, £1 5s; G. F. Schafer, 4s; J. H. C. (Canada), 9s; F. Smith, 4s; C. Roberts, 8s 6d; G. K. P., 6s; T. C. Alexander, 9s; W. Hammond, 4s; E.K.F., (U.S.A.), 11s 5d.

Our thanks to you all. 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Co-op. No. L.99482. FINchley 5135.
Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST?

— and it's cheaper too!

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

I enclose 21s. (Overseas, 24s., Canada and USA, $3.50), for year's subscription from the

.....issue.

(SIGNED) .....

To LABOUR MONTHLY

134, BALLARDS LANE,

LONDON, N.3.

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes.

117, High Street, Croydon, Surrey.
'Phone CROydon 4328

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating by craftsmen

TOTtenham 2362

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.
Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or
Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.
THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

LABOUR RESEARCH

'Backdrop to the Crisis'

'The Problem of Capital Exports'

1s. or 1s. 2½d. by post
Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(*3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly,* 134, *Ballards Lane, London, N.3.*)

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: PRO 7254. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

KENT—RAMSGATE & DISTRICT. For details of properties for sale apply: LESLIE HOGBIN & PARTNERS, 48, Queen Street, Ramsgate. Tel. Thanet 53222.

STILL AVAILABLE. Some early copies of *LM*, and a few copies of pamphlets issued by *LM* in earlier years, as well as the popular 'Rise and Fall of the Daily Herald'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

25-YEAR INDEX

The editors of *Science & Society* are pleased to announce the publication of a general index (author, subject, title and books reviewed) to the contents of the first quarter-century of our journal covering the period 1936-1961.

$6.00 (paper) Pp. 146 (two columns)

Please send all orders directly to the publisher:

SCIENCE & SOCIETY, INC.
30 East 20th Street
New York, N. Y. 10003

NEW YEAR GREETINGS

to all
readers of

Labour Monthly

from the Editor
and staff of

SOVIET PUBLICATIONS

3 ROSARY GARDENS
LONDON SW7

Labour Monthly

BOUND VOLUME
FOR 1964

Orders being taken now!

Through your usual newsagent, price £1 10s. 0d., or send 10s. 6d. plus 1s. 6d. postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

The Manager, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED